(1)

SINGLE BENCH

C. S. 100/-

(6)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHATISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO. 3551 /2006

PETITIONER

G.R. Puraina, Son of Shri K.R. Puraina, Aged about 51 years, Presently working as Rural Agriculture Extension Officer, Block Development, Nagari, Dhamtari, District-Dhamtari (Chhattisgarh)

P.R. No. 3/6/06
Presented by Shri Akhilesh Jain
date 14/7/06

V E R S U S

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through its Secretary, Department of Agriculture, Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

2. Senior Agriculture Extension Officer, Dhamtari, District-Dhamtari (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, CERTIORARI, PROHIBITION AND FOR OTHER SUITABLE WRIT OR WRITS, ORDER OR ORDERS, DIRECTION OR DIRECTIONS.

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..WP.No..3551. **सन् 200** 6

32

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश

19.7.2006:-

Shri Akhilesh Dalpati, counsel for the petitioner.

Miss Dipali Pandey, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondents, on advance copy.

Heard

By the instant petition, the petitioner has challenged the order dated 1st July 2006 whereby he has been transferred from Block Dhamtari, District Dhamtari to Block Nagari, District Dhamtari at his own expenses.

The main grievance raised by the petitioner in this petition is that he had never requested for his transfer. Without his request the petitioner has been transferred ~~at the present place of posting~~ on his own expenses showing that the transfer has been made on his request.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner may be allowed to make a representation to the respondent No.1 and he be directed to decide the same, to which learned counsel for respondents has no objection.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case, as per the allegations of the petitioner that the petitioner never requested for his transfer whereas, he has been shown to be transferred at his request, and without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case, the prayer made by learned counsel for the petitioner is just, fair and reasonable. Therefore, the petitioner is allowed to make a detailed representation along with a copy of this petition to respondent No.1 raising all his grievances within a period of 10 days from today and in turn, respondent No.1 shall decide the representation of the petitioner within a period of 30 days from the date of receipt of the representation, in an objective manner, after considering all the points

P.T.O.

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक ..... सन् 200

33

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश -2-	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	raised by the petitioner and pass appropriate order, in accordance with law. In the meantime, it is directed that the effect and operation of the impugned order in respect of the petitioner shall remain stayed, till the decision of the representation of the petitioner. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.2743/2006 and I.A. No.6891/2006 also stand disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. Sd/- L.C. Bhadoo Judge	
Barve		